

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7, 26-35 and 37-39 are currently pending in the subject application, and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-7, 26-35 and 37-39 are rejected. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

**I. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5, 26-29 and 32-33 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-3, 5, 26-29 and 32-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,148,261 to Obradovich, et al. ("Obradovich") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0066672 to Watchko, et al. ("Watchko"). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1, in pertinent part, recites a tablet computer assembly comprising a global positioning system module, an L-band transceiver, a processing unit, and a Faraday cage that encloses the L-band transceiver and the global positioning system module to reduce electromagnetic interference with the L-band transceiver and the global positioning module, the Faraday cage being configured as a heat sink to draw heat from the L-band transceiver away from the processing unit, the Faraday cage being mounted to a back of the processing unit.

Obradovich appears to describe a personal communication device having a GPS module and a communications device. The device is illustrated in FIGS.2 and 3 as having a display and keypad on a first side, and a rear case with a speaker and microphone. FIG. 3 illustrates a processor, memory, and antenna inside the rear case. It will be appreciated that there is no indication in FIG. 3 that the processor is partitioned from the antenna and any related transceiver structure. Watchko appears to describe a spray-on metallic coating that can be applied to plastic parts to allow for a measure of heat conduction and electromagnetic shielding.

It is respectfully submitted that Obradovich in view of Watchko fails to teach or suggest a tablet computer assembly with a processing unit and a Faraday cage enclosing an L-band transceiver and a global positioning system module mounted to the back of the processing unit. The Office Action relies on Watchko to provide a teaching of a Faraday cage, but all Watchko teaches is the use of a spray-on coating on plastic parts to provide some heat transference and

protection from electromagnetic interference. The logical path for one of skill in the art, seeking to apply the teachings of Watchko to Obradovich, would be to simply “metalize” the existing structure to protect the electronics systems in the personal communications device of Obradovich from external interference. Neither reference, taken alone or in combination, provides a suggestion of separately mounting the GPS module and the transceiver in a separate unit on the back of the processing unit, specifically the recited Faraday cage, to isolate the heat and electromagnetic interference produced by the transceiver from the processing unit. Absent such a teaching or suggestion, it is respectfully submitted that one of skill in the art, aware of Watchko and Obradovich, would not find it obvious to combine the references to provide the claimed system absent the teachings of the present invention.

Claim 26, which depends from claim 1, recites that a back wall of the processing unit forms one wall of the Faraday cage and a metallic enclosure comprises the remainder of the Faraday cage. Claim 29 is an independent claim reciting similar subject matter. It is respectfully submitted that, as described above, Obradovich in view of Watchko does not teach or suggest a Faraday cage where one wall of the cage is a back plate of a tablet computer or other processing unit and the remainder of the Faraday cage is formed of a separate metallic enclosure. It is thus respectfully submitted that claims 26 and 29 are patentable over the cited art and the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 27, and 28 each depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Claims 32 and 33 each depend, directly and indirectly, from claim 29. Each of claims 2, 3, 5, 27, 28, 32, and 33 should be patentable for at least the reasons discussed for their respective base claims. Accordingly, for the reasons described above, claims 1-3, 5, 26-29 and 32-33 should be patentable over the cited art. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

## **II. Rejection of Claim 4 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of Watchko, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of “Xilinx” by Bielby (“Bielby”). Bielby does not remedy the deficiencies of Obradovich and Watchko with respect to claim 1 as

described previously. Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 defines over the cited art, and withdrawal the rejection of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

### **III. Rejection of Claims 6, 30, 34 and 36-39 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 6, 30, 34 and 36-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of Watchko, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,542,117 to Broughton ("Broughton"), and in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0032426 to Gilbert, et al. ("Gilbert"). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 34 defines patentable invention over Obradovich, Gilbert, and Broughton, as one skilled in the art, presented with these references, would not be led to design a tablet computer assembly having an antenna shared by an L-band transceiver and a GPS system. The Office Action notes that Obradovich, Watchko, and Broughton do not teach a single antenna that is shared by an L-band transmitter and a GPS receiver, relying on Gilbert to provide this teaching. It is respectfully submitted, however, that the teachings of Gilbert, even taken in combination with Obradovich and Broughton, would not lead one skilled in the art to utilize a single shared antenna for an L-band transceiver and a GPS system. To begin with, it is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would not look to a vehicle-based system, namely the aircraft communications system of Gilbert, to modify the portable communication system of Obradovich. With the space available in an aircraft, the Gilbert system can utilize various mechanisms, such as spatial separation or heavy shielding, that are not available for a portable communications system. See Gilbert, ¶0053. The Examiner has stated that the fact that Gilbert is vehicle based is not relevant, but it is respectfully submitted that the claimed system is intended to overcome limitations of handheld communications systems, specifically the lack of space and power that an aircraft system simply does not need to overcome. Accordingly, one of skill in the art would not seek teachings from a vehicle based system to overcome the problems inherent to a handheld communication system.

Further, Gilbert specifically teaches away from the claimed system. While Gilbert does state the GPS antenna 54 can be shared with an antenna that transmits packet data to a satellite, it specifically states that the GPS antenna “may be any L-band antenna used for data or voice reception (*e.g.*, where no L-band transmission occurs on that antenna).” Gilbert ¶0053. Accordingly, at best, Gilbert provides an ambiguous teaching to one skilled in the art, and in fact, warns one skilled in the art away from allowing a GPS system to share an antenna with an L-band transmitter. Since claim 34 recites an L-band transceiver that transmits location data, it is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art, guided by Gilbert, would not seek to create the system recited in claim 34. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 34 defines patentable invention over the cited art, and the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 34 is respectfully requested.

Claim 6, which depends from claim 1, and claim 30, which depends from claim 29, each recite a single antenna shared by the L-band transceiver and the global positioning system. Claims 6 and 29 should thus be allowable both due to the deficiencies of Gilbert, as described above, as well as for the reasons described for their respective base claims. It is thus respectfully submitted that claims 6 and 29 should be allowable over the cited art, and the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 36 was cancelled in the Amendment dated April 14, 2008.

Claims 37-39 each depend from claim 34 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 37-39 defines over the cited art, and withdrawal the rejection of claims 37-39 is respectfully requested

For the reasons described above, claims 6, 30, 34 and 37-39 should be patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Rejection of Claims 7, 31 and 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 7, 31 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of Watchko, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Broughton, and further in view of Gilbert, as applied to claim 6, and further in view of U.S. Publication No.

2005/0162334 to Saunders, et al. ("Saunders"). It is respectfully submitted that the earliest reference date of Saunders under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is the PCT filing date of February 18, 2003. *See* MPEP 2136.03(I). In an Amendment dated April 14, 2008, Applicants submitted affidavits and evidence of character and weight as to establish conception and diligent reduction of practice of the claimed system by February 13, 2003. It is thus respectfully submitted that Saunders does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and no other section of 35 U.S.C. §102 appears to be applicable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 31, and 35 is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and that the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 2, 2008

/Christopher P. Harris/

Christopher P. Harris  
Registration No. 43,660

CUSTOMER NO.: 26,294

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL, & TUMMINO L.L.P.  
1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700  
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114  
Phone: (216) 621-2234  
Fax: (216) 621-4072